



Supreme Court of California
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797
www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Cathal Conneely](mailto:Cathal.Conneely@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

September 1, 2017

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of August 28, 2017

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#17-266 *City of Oroville v. Superior Court*, S243247. (C077181; nonpublished opinion; Butte County Superior Court; 152036.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. This case presents the following issue: Is a city liable for inverse condemnation when a blockage in a city sewer main and the absence of a legally required backwater valve on private property caused sewage to back up onto that property?

#17-267 *People v. Baker*, S243009. (F071120; nonpublished opinion; Tulare County Superior Court; VCF295267.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Mendoza*, S241647 (#17-208), which presents the following issue: Are the provisions of Proposition 57 that eliminated the direct filing of certain juvenile cases in adult court applicable to cases not yet final on appeal?

#17-268 *In re F.P.*, S243356. (G053275; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court; DL040527-006.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order granting a petition to recall sentence. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re C.B.*, S237801 (#16-384), and *In re C.H.*, S237762 (#16-395), which present the following issues: Did the trial court err by refusing to order the expungement of juvenile's DNA record after his qualifying felony conviction was reduced to a misdemeanor under Proposition 47 (Pen. Code § 1170.18)? Does the

retention of juvenile's DNA sample violate equal protection because a person who committed the same offense after Proposition 47 was enacted would be under no obligation to provide a DNA sample?

#

The Supreme Court of California is the state's highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court's primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.